

Exhibit 9

KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
AND AFFILIATED PARTNERSHIPS

655 Fifteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

Sean M. McElroy
To Call Writer Directly:
(202) 879-5161
smcelroy@kirkland.com

(202) 879-5000
www.kirkland.com

Facsimile:
(202) 879-5200

May 12, 2011

Via Email

Andrew Weiss
12424 Wilshire Blvd.
Suite 1200
Los Angeles, CA 90025

David T. McDonald
925 Fourth Ave.
Suite 2900
Seattle, WA 98104

Re: *NeuroGrafix, et al. v. Siemens Medical Solutions USA, Inc., et al.*, Case
No. 10-CV-1990 (C.D. Cal.)

Dear Counsel:

I am writing regarding several issues related to the Court's May 5, 2011 Claim Construction Order.

First, in light of the Court finding claims 36, 39, 46, 49, 55, 58, and 61 indefinite, do Plaintiffs agree that those claims are invalid under the Court's claim construction order?

Second, in light of the Court finding claims 36, 39, 46, 49, 55, 58, and 61 indefinite, do Plaintiffs agree that claims depending on those claims are also indefinite and therefore invalid under the Court's claim construction order?

Third, in light of the Court's construction of "vector processing" and Plaintiffs' infringement contentions, do Plaintiffs agree that Siemens does not infringe any of the claims incorporating the "vector processing" limitation under the Court's construction of that phrase?

Fourth, in light of the Court's construction of the corresponding structure for claim 54 as being certain blocks in Figures 9 and 10 of the '360 patent and in light of NeuroGrafix's infringement contentions, does NeuroGrafix agree that Siemens does not infringe claims 54 and 63-66?

Please let us know if you agree to each of these general items and we will prepare a more detailed joint stipulation for your review. If you do not agree to one of the items above, please let us know the basis for that disagreement.

Andrew Weiss, Esq.
May 12, 2011
Page 2

Sincerely,



Sean M. McEldowney